

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 529

October 27, 1995, 1:56 p.m.  
Page S-16004 Temp. Record

## BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION/Tax Millionaires for More Spending

**SUBJECT:** Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995 . . . S. 1357. Domenici motion to table the Lautenberg substitute amendment No. 3007 to the Craig amendment No. 3005 to the Lautenberg motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions.

### ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 55-44

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 1357, the Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, will result in a balanced budget in seven years, as scored by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). The bill will also provide a \$245 billion middle-class tax cut, \$141.4 billion of which will be to provide a \$500 per child tax credit.

The Lautenberg motion to commit the bill to the Finance Committee with instructions would require the Committee to report the bill back within 3 session days with provisions to limit any individual income tax reduction to individuals with incomes under \$1 million, and to use the resulting savings to increase the spending growth rate for the Medicaid and Medicare Programs.

The Craig first-degree amendment to the Lautenberg amendment would strike the Lautenberg amendment's instructions and would instead instruct the Committee to add at the end of the bill a new provision to create a \$5,000 tax credit for adoption expenses. The effective date of the Craig amendment would be January 3, 1995.

**The Lautenberg second-degree substitute amendment** to the Craig amendment would strike all after the word instructions and insert language identical to the underlying Lautenberg motion.

The motion and amendments were offered after all debate time had expired. However, by unanimous consent, 1 minute of debate on the amendment was permitted. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

**NOTE:** Also pending to the Craig amendment at the time of the vote was a Dole second-degree amendment that would add at the end of the bill identical language as in the Craig amendment, except that it would change the effective date to February 2, 1995. The Dole amendment was offered prior to the offering of the Lautenberg amendment. The wording of the Dole amendment does not make clear whether it was intended to be a perfecting amendment or a substitute amendment. However, the wording of the Lautenberg

(See other side)

YEAS (55)			NAYS (44)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (52 or 98%)		Democrats (3 or 7%)	Republicans (1 or 2%)	Democrats (43 or 93%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
Abraham	Helms	Heflin	Specter	Akaka	Hollings		
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Lieberman		Baucus	Inouye		
Bennett	Inhofe	Nunn		Biden	Johnston		
Bond	Jeffords			Bingaman	Kennedy		
Brown	Kassebaum			Boxer	Kerrey		
Burns	Kempthorne			Bradley	Kerry		
Campbell	Kyl			Breaux	Kohl		
Chafee	Lott			Bryan	Lautenberg		
Coats	Lugar			Bumpers	Leahy		
Cochran	Mack			Byrd	Levin		
Cohen	McCain			Conrad	Mikulski		
Coverdell	McConnell			Daschle	Moseley-Braun		
Craig	Murkowski			Dodd	Moynihan		
D'Amato	Nickles			Dorgan	Murray		
DeWine	Pressler			Exon	Pell		
Dole	Roth			Feingold	Pryor		
Domenici	Santorum			Feinstein	Reid		
Faircloth	Shelby			Ford	Robb		
Frist	Simpson			Glenn	Rockefeller		
Gorton	Smith			Graham	Sarbanes		
Gramm	Snowe			Harkin	Simon		
Grams	Stevens				Wellstone		
Grassley	Thomas						
Gregg	Thompson						
Hatch	Thurmond						
Hatfield	Warner						

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

amendment indicates that it was a substitute amendment. Two substitutes may not be pending at one time to an amendment to a motion, nor may a substitute amendment be offered to an amendment if a perfecting amendment is already pending. Therefore, whether the Dole amendment was a perfecting amendment or a substitute amendment, it appears that the Lautenberg amendment was not in order and should not have been considered (see Chart 1 in Riddick's for the governing amendment tree). Following the tabling of the Lautenberg amendment, the underlying amendments and motion were withdrawn.

**Those favoring** the motion to table contended:

Our colleagues are aware that there is no connection between the tax relief in this bill which will allow Americans to keep more of their own money which they earned and the slowing in the rates of growth in Medicare and Medicaid. We have already twice rejected this shameless demagoguery of our colleagues which, if it succeeds, will destroy these health care programs on which senior citizens rely (see vote Nos. 460 and 495), and we will of course reject it again on this amendment.

**Those opposing** the motion to table contended:

This bill will cut money for Medicare and Medicaid to pay for tax breaks. The Lautenberg amendment would lessen those cuts by denying tax breaks for millionaires. We hope Senators can admit that we should not cut Medicare and Medicaid in order to give more money to rich people.